



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,360	06/13/2005	Paul Alfred Cornwell	J3704(C)	6009
201	7590	11/10/2009	EXAMINER	
UNILEVER PATENT GROUP 800 SYLVAN AVENUE AG West S. Wing ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS, NJ 07632-3100			WEDDINGTON, KEVIN E	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		1614	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
11/10/2009	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

[patentgroupus@unilever.com](mailto:patentgroupus@unilever.com)

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/538,360	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CORNWELL ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> KEVIN WEDDINGTON	<b>Art Unit</b> 1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2009.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4 and 6-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-8 and 13-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-16 are presented for examination.

Applicants' request for continued examination, amendment and response filed September 16, 2009 have been received and entered.

Accordingly, the rejections made under provisional obviousness-type double patenting over claim 1 of copending Application No. 11/547,576; and over claim 1 of copending Application No. 11/547,577 at pages 2-3 as applied to claim 1 is hereby withdrawn because of applicants' remarks.

Accordingly, the rejection made under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over JP 61-238894 A of PTO-1449, hereby known as Sunstar KK in view of WO 97/14401 A1, hereby known as Nakajima et al. as set forth at pages 3-4 as applied to claims 1, 4, 6-8 and 13-15 is hereby withdrawn because the applicants amended claim 1 by deleting the word "cellobiose".

Claims 9-12 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to the non-elected invention (37 CFR 1.142(b)).

#### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 1 is again provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 12/086,091. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the only difference between the present claim and the copending claim lies in the present claim, an additional agent is administered with the disaccharide and the di-acid.

The present claim would anticipate the copending claim because the copending claim recite the term "comprising" and thus opens the claim to the inclusion of additional active agent(s).

Claim 1 is not allowed.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which

was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

This is a New Matter rejection.

Applicants' specification does not provide any support for the new claim 16 with the newly transitional phrase "consists essentially of". Nowhere in the instant specification supports is the instant hair treatment composition limited to the three active components.

Claim 16 is not allowed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2 is rendered indefinite because claim 1 is limited to "trehalose" and claim 1 is repeating the same active agent.

Claim 2 is not allowed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 1614

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 01/68040, hereby known as Cannell et al., in view of JP 11-199445, hereby known as Megumi et al., and further in view of WO 97/14401, hereby known as Nakajima et al.

Cannell et al. teach compositions for treatment of keratinous tissue comprising a plant extract (potato extract) and a sugar (trehalose) [page 4, paragraph 2 and page 5, paragraph 3]. The sugar content is in the of 0.01-3% [page 10, paragraph 4]. The

Art Unit: 1614

composition provides protection of the hair from extrinsic damage such as chemical (dyes) and improved combability [page 4, paragraph 2].

The instant invention differs from the cited reference in that the cited reference does not teach the addition of a di-acid. However, the secondary reference, Megumi et al., teaches hair cosmetics (treatments) [paragraph 1] that give the hair better lubricity and adhesion of dyes, due to the presence of 1-20% aliphatic carboxylic acid, such as adipic and succinic acids and aromatic alcohols [abstract and paragraphs 9 and 10].

The instant invention differs from the cited references in that the cited references do not teach the addition of a third agent, a guanidium salt. However, the tertiary reference, Nakajima et al., teaches the use of guanidine derivatives [see page 34] in skin and hair composition is well-known in the art.

Clearly, one skilled in the art would have assumed the combination of three individual agents, each well-known in hair art, into a single composition would give an additive effect in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8 and 13-15 are not allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN WEDDINGTON whose telephone number is (571)272-0587. The examiner can normally be reached on 12:30 pm - 9:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on (571)272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KEVIN WEDDINGTON  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1614

/KEVIN WEDDINGTON/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1614